

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 65588

**Title:** ROBOTIC SURGERY IN COLON CANCER: CURRENT EVIDENCE AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES. A NARRATIVE REVIEW

**Reviewer's code:** 02823583

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Doctor, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Sweden

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-22 04:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-22 04:50

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

It is a well written narrative review. Needs an extra language control for minor mistakes like in line 131 = written al least instead of at least.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 65588

**Title:** ROBOTIC SURGERY IN COLON CANCER: CURRENT EVIDENCE AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES. A NARRATIVE REVIEW

**Reviewer's code:** 03733992

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-26 14:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-26 14:53

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this peer review. The topic contrasts robotic with laparoscopic surgery, and highlights the non-inferiority of robotic surgery. The authors also argue that it may be better than laparoscopic surgery. The manuscript requires major revisions before it is suitable for publication. 1) There are many grammatical errors throughout (I have highlighted a few, but there are many spread throughout): -lines 44-45 - enables, improves - incorrect pairing of words with a comma -line 52 - for better looking - this does not make sense and sounds too colloquial -lines 73-74 - enables surgeons - this is a verb, the rest of the list does not have verbs -line 86- remain should be replaced with are -line 91 - of laparoscopy - of is incorrectly used -Line 105 - Inpatient is misspelled -TME - this should be spelled out the first time it is used Major revisions: The manuscript requires a lot more detail, supporting evidence, and certain sections need to be expanded. -line 115 - What are reasons for the longer operative times? Elaborate more on the study -The similar comment goes for all studies listed - for example, the authors cite a study from Michigan (reference 6) - tell the readers how many individuals, what were the conversion rates and LOS, and what were the rates of complication? -Lines 145 - "for this and other reasons it has been criticized" - this is not professionally worded. Please list the reasons. Also, this is a scientific review and not a conversation. -Lines 165-235 - remember, the average reader is not an expert on this topic. They cannot take for granted what your thoughts are. You have shared one sentence thoughts. Each of these sections need to be expanded upon - dive into the detail, elaborate on the studies you have references, give n, variables of interest - are they primary or secondary outcome, what types of studies, and what are the actual rates. Then you can share your thoughts.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 65588

**Title:** ROBOTIC SURGERY IN COLON CANCER: CURRENT EVIDENCE AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES. A NARRATIVE REVIEW

**Reviewer's code:** 03805385

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FASCRS, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Attending Doctor, Doctor, Medical Assistant, Postdoctoral Fellow, Research Associate, Senior Research Fellow, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Brazil

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-22 10:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-30 11:18

**Review time:** 8 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this paper. Excellent review!